

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-45 are presently active; Claims 1, 9, 25, and 30 have been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1- 6 and 8-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiarabini et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,216). Claim 7 was objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Firstly, Applicant's representative acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 7.

Secondly, Applicant's representative acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Brinich to interview this case on August 15, 2005, as substantially summarized herebelow.

During the interview, differences between the print job control described in the specification and that of Chiarabini et al were discussed. As discussed, the specification describes on page 4, lines 5-9, that at step 110 the user checks to see that the print setting are correct for the impending print job, and states that, if correct, the user selects the "Continue" button 300 and flow proceeds to step 114. The print job is then issued to the printer using the current print settings.

In Chiarabini et al, Chiarabini et al disclose that:

FIG. 8 shows warning dialog box 230 containing the following text:
"The Scaling 'From' and 'To' paper sizes do not have the same proportions.
Automatically adjust 'From' proportions?" [emphasis added]

Thereafter, Chiarabini et al disclose a number of criteria in Tables 2-8 that are used to determine if the scaling is important, thus indicating that processing of the print job for printing

has begun when the error message in Figure 8 is realized.

Chiarabini et al disclose with regard to Figure 9 that:

In the preferred embodiment, when the print preview is enabled, a *wireframe version* of the job *that is being printed* is gradually drawn in the preview window of display 206. The user can wait to see the preview of each page and then validate the output to *continue printing* on printer 205. Alternatively, the user can skip the preview process for the current page being previewed and the rest of the pages for the job and begin printing right away on printer 205. Alternatively, the user can cancel the printing job at any time.¹ [emphasis added]

Thus, as emphasized above, the features in Figure 9 of Chiarabini et al relate to features displayed after the print job is being processed (i.e., displayed while the job is being printed).

Chiarabini et al later disclose that:

FIGS. 11 through 15 illustrate the user interface window presented by printer driver 203 on monitor 204 to a user *when printing is performed*. In FIG. 11, print preview is disabled. Within a print progress window 250 (print progress window 250 is a user interface dialog box), a print preview area 251 represents the physical page that will be printed out by printer 205. Print progress window is a user interface dialog box. Within preview area 251 is shown a shaded area which represents the printable area on a page. An icon 253 and text 252 indicate that printing is occurring. A user can cancel printing by selecting "Cancel" button 254.² [emphasis added]

Hence, Figures 11-15 are displays available to the user to while the printing is being performed. Thus, Figure 13 cited in the Office Action as an example of the claimed printing information dialogue box is a display occurring *after the print job has been processed*, not prior to processing of the print job. Indeed, the print job has been compiled and is being processed when the print preview in Figure 13 of Chiarabini et al is shown, else the view of the motorcycle shown in Figure 13 could not be seen. While a user in the embodiment of Figure 13 of Chiarabini et al can cancel printing by selecting the "Cancel" button 274, it is respectfully submitted that the cancellation merely stops on-going and subsequent print jobs.

With Chiarabini et al teaching control of print jobs *after a print job has been processed*,

¹ Chiarabini et al, col. 10, lines 44-53.

as agreed to during the interview, the presently amended independent claims distinguish from Chiarabini et al in that the printing information dialogue box of Claim 1 displays, *prior to processing of the print job for printing*, a synopsis of the print setting including at least an indication of a paper selection.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and similarly presently amended independent Claims 9, 25, and 30 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over the applied prior art.

Finally, the examiner's attention is invited to dependent Claims 15-23, 28-29 and 36-45 in which the present invention permits a user to reiteratively cancel, review, and cancel or resubmit the print job. Such capabilities are not disclosed by Chiarabini et al in which the jobs are merely canceled by the user with no capability to refine the print settings without submitting a new print job. Hence, these claims for their dependence on the independent claims and their further distinction from Chiarabini et al are believed to patentably define over Chiarabini et al.

² Chiarabini et al, col. 10, line 62, to col. 11, line 3.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph. D.
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
JJK:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\52440128\8-2005AM1.DOC